

### **Remarks**

In the present response, claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-20 are presented for examination. No new matter is added.

### **Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 7,091,959 (Clary) in view of USPN 6,002,853 (deHond). This rejection is traversed.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art cited must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2143. For at least the following reasons, Applicant asserts that the rejection does not satisfy these criteria.

#### Claim 1

Claim 1 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Clary in view of deHond. For example, claim 1 recites “an electronic tablet having a screen with plural predefined regions that receive handwritten mnemonic symbols that are hints for different Internet data addresses.”

The Office Action argues that this recitation is shown in Clary at Fig. 3 (shown by the email region). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Fig. 3 in Clary depicts an email region for receiving handwritten email addresses. A handwritten email address, however, is not a mnemonic symbol for an email address. By contrast, an email address is the actual email address. In other words, nowhere does Clary suggest that users would enter a mnemonic symbol for the email address instead of the actual email address. Furthermore, claim 1 recites that the mnemonic symbol is a hint for the internet address. Nowhere does Clary suggest that users would enter “hints” for an internet address instead of the actual internet address.

According to MPEP § 2111.01, the words of a claim must be given their “plain meaning.” Merriam-Webster has an online dictionary ([www.m-w.com](http://www.m-w.com)) that defines “mnemonic” as: “assisting or intending to assist memory” and defines the word “symbol” as: “something that stands for or suggests something else by reason of relationship, association, convention, or accidental resemblance.” Merriam-Webster further defines the word “hint” as: “a statement conveying by implication what it is preferred not to say explicitly.” Applicant states that Clary does not teach or suggest receiving “mnemonic symbols” that are “hints” for internet addresses per the plain meaning of these terms.

Applicant acknowledges that claims must be given their broadest interpretation during patent examination. However, this interpretation must be a “**reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification**” (see MPEP 2111: emphasis added). Applicant’s specification repeatedly uses the terms “mnemonic symbol” that are “hints” for internet addresses in a manner consistent with the plain meaning of these terms. Applicant’s specification provides an example of this recitation:

As depicted by FIG. 2C, using an inking stylus 211 associated with the tablet 205, the end-user 200 writes a symbol – in this example "GW" – or any other mnemonic hint 213 associated with the site on the writing surface 207. As a result of this action, the geometric coordinates of the visible mnemonic hint 213 become an index for the URL of the current web page – e.g., [http://www.mount\\_vernon.com](http://www.mount_vernon.com) – in accordance with the present invention as described in more detail hereinafter. (See paragraph [0025])

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Clary in view of deHond. The dependent claims are allowable for at least these reasons.

As yet another example, claim 1 recites the following (emphasis added):

wherein subsequently accessing one of the predefined regions with said stylus triggers a shift, on a display separate from the

tablet, to one of said Internet data addresses associated with a **handwritten mnemonic symbol** in the one of the predefined regions.

The Office Action admits that Clary does not teach this recitation. Applicant agrees with this admission. The Office Action, however, attempts to cure this deficiency with column 2, lines 45-65 in deHond. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Column 2, lines 45-65 in deHond states that users can click on “hyperlinked terms or graphics on a web page” and be taken to the web page. Nowhere does deHond disclose or even suggest that these hyperlinks or graphics are “handwritten mnemonic symbols.”

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Clary in view of deHond. The dependent claims are allowable for at least these reasons.

#### Claim 5

Claim 5 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Clary in view of deHond. For example, claim 5 recites a writing tablet having a handwritten mnemonic symbol. The symbol is a user recognizable hint for an internet site.

The Office Action argues that this recitation is shown in Clary at Fig. 3 (shown by the email region). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Fig. 3 in Clary depicts an email region for receiving handwritten email addresses. A handwritten email address, however, is not a mnemonic symbol for an email address. By contrast, an email address is the actual email address. In other words, nowhere does Clary suggest that users would enter a mnemonic symbol for the email address instead of the actual email address. Furthermore, claim 5 recites that the mnemonic symbol is a user recognizable hint for the internet address. Nowhere does Clary suggest that users would enter “hints” for an internet address instead of the actual internet address.

As noted above with regard to claim 1, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to interpret the words in claim 5 in accordance with their plain meaning.

For at least these reasons, claim 5 is allowable over Clary in view of deHond. The dependent claims are allowable for at least these reasons.

As yet another example, claim 5 recites that the mnemonic symbols are on a **random** location on the writing tablet. Clary actually teaches away from this recitation. As shown in Fig. 3 of Clary, the user enters the email address at predefined locations on the predefined form.

For at least these reasons, claim 5 is allowable over Clary in view of deHond. The dependent claims are allowable for at least these reasons.

As yet another example, claim 5 recites the following (emphasis added):

associating an address indicative of the first of said sites with a first location coordinate address on a computer writing tablet, separate from said electronic device, via a first **handwritten mnemonic symbol** that is a user recognizable hint for the first of said sites, the hint for the first of said sites being on a first random location on said writing tablet during access of said first of said sites;

associating an address indicative of the second of said sites with a second location coordinate address on the computer writing tablet via a second **handwritten mnemonic symbol** that is a user recognizable hint for the second of said sites, the hint for the second of said sites being on a second random location on said writing tablet during access of said second of said sites.

The Office Action appears to admit that Clary does not teach variations these recitations. Applicant agrees with this admission. The Office Action, however, attempts to cure this deficiency with column 2, lines 45-65 in deHond. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Column 2, lines 45-65 in deHond states that users can click on “hyperlinked terms or graphics on a web page” and be taken to the web page. Nowhere does deHond disclose or even suggest that these hyperlinks or graphics are “handwritten mnemonic symbols.”

For at least these reasons, claim 5 is allowable over Clary in view of deHond. The dependent claims are allowable for at least these reasons.

### Claim 8

Claim 8 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Clary in view of deHond. For example, claim 8 recites writing a mnemonic object on a computer writing tablet. Claim 8 then recites that the mnemonic object is “a user recognizable hint” for an internet address.

The Office Action argues that this recitation is shown in Clary at Fig. 3 (shown by the email region). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Fig. 3 in Clary depicts an email region for receiving handwritten email addresses. A handwritten email address, however, is not a mnemonic object for an email address. By contrast, an email address is the actual email address. In other words, nowhere does Clary suggest that users would enter a mnemonic object for the email address instead of the actual email address. Furthermore, claim 8 recite that the mnemonic object is a user recognizable hint for the internet address. Nowhere does Clary suggest that users would enter objects that are “hints” for an internet address instead of the actual internet address.

As noted above with regard to claim 1, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to interpret the words in claim 8 in accordance with their plain meaning.

For at least these reasons, claim 8 is allowable over Clary in view of deHond. The dependent claims are allowable for at least these reasons.

As yet another example, claim 8 recites the following (emphasis added):

when each of a plurality of the Internet-associated computer data addresses is accessed on a computer separate from the computer writing tablet, writing a mnemonic object on said computer writing tablet, wherein a location on said computer writing tablet of the mnemonic object is coupled to a current one of said Internet-associated computer data addresses and said mnemonic object is handwritten and a user recognizable hint for the current one of said Internet-associated computer data addresses.

The Office Action appears to admit that Clary does not teach this recitation. Applicant agrees with this admission. The Office Action, however, attempts to cure this deficiency with column 2, lines 45-65 in deHond. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Column 2, lines 45-65 in deHond states that users can click on “hyperlinked terms or graphics on a web page” and be taken to the web page. Nowhere does deHond disclose or even suggest that these hyperlinks or graphics are “handwritten mnemonic objects.”

For at least these reasons, claim 8 is allowable over Clary in view of deHond. The dependent claims are allowable for at least these reasons.

#### Claim 11

Claim 11 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Clary in view of deHond. For example, claim 11 recites receiving a handwritten symbol for an internet site. Claim 11 then recites that the symbol is “a user recognizable hint” for the internet address.

The Office Action argues that this recitation is shown in Clary at Fig. 3 (shown by the email region). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Fig. 3 in Clary depicts an email region for receiving handwritten email addresses. A handwritten email address, however, is not a symbol for an email address. By contrast, an email address is the actual email address. In other words, nowhere does Clary suggest that users would enter a “symbol” for the email address instead of the actual email address. Furthermore, claim 11 recites that the symbol is a user recognizable hint for the internet address. Nowhere does Clary suggest that users would enter symbols that are “hints” for an internet address instead of the actual internet address.

As noted above with regard to claim 1, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to interpret the words in claim 11 in accordance with their plain meaning.

For at least these reasons, claim 11 is allowable over Clary in view of deHond. The dependent claims are allowable for at least these reasons.

As yet another example, claim 11 recites the following (emphasis added):

selecting the **handwritten** symbol on the computer writing tablet to cause the electronic device to navigate to the internet site.

The Office Action appears to admit that Clary does not teach this recitation. Applicant agrees with this admission. The Office Action, however, attempts to cure this deficiency with column 2, lines 45-65 in deHond. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Column 2, lines 45-65 in deHond states that users can click on “hyperlinked terms or graphics on a web page” and be taken to the web page. Nowhere does deHond disclose or even suggest that these hyperlinks or graphics are “handwritten symbols.”

For at least these reasons, claim 11 is allowable over Clary in view of deHond. The dependent claims are allowable for at least these reasons.

#### Claim 15

Claim 15 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Clary in view of deHond. For example, claim 15 recites code for storing symbols that are associated with an internet site. Claim 15 then recites that the symbols are “a user recognizable hint” for the internet address.

The Office Action argues that this recitation is shown in Clary at Fig. 3 (shown by the email region). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Fig. 3 in Clary depicts an email region for receiving handwritten email addresses. A handwritten email address, however, is not a symbol for an email address. By contrast, an email address is the actual email address. In other words, nowhere does Clary suggest that users would enter a “symbol” for the email address instead of the actual email address. Furthermore, claim 15 recites that the symbol is a user recognizable hint for the internet address. Nowhere does Clary suggest that users would enter symbols that are “hints” for an internet address instead of the actual internet address.

As noted above with regard to claim 1, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to interpret the words in claim 15 in accordance with their plain meaning.

For at least these reasons, claim 15 is allowable over Clary in view of deHond. The dependent claims are allowable for at least these reasons.

As yet another example, claim 15 recites the following:

computer code for accessing said Internet site address by clicking said temporary symbols displayed on a display of the computer writing tablet.

The Office Action appears to admit that Clary does not teach this recitation. Applicant agrees with this admission. The Office Action, however, attempts to cure this deficiency with column 2, lines 45-65 in deHond. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Column 2, lines 45-65 in deHond states that users can click on “hyperlinked terms or graphics on a web page” and be taken to the web page. Nowhere does deHond disclose or even suggest that these hyperlinks or graphics are “handwritten symbols” (note: the claim is amended to recite that the temporary symbols are “handwritten”).

For at least these reasons, claim 15 is allowable over Clary in view of deHond. The dependent claims are allowable for at least these reasons.

#### Claim 17

Claim 17 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Clary in view of deHond. For example, claim 17 recites generating bookmarks on a tablet. Claim 17 then recites that the bookmarks are a “handwritten mnemonic hint that is user recognizable” as an internet address

The Office Action argues that this recitation is shown in Clary at Fig. 3 (shown by the email region). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Fig. 3 in Clary depicts an email region for receiving handwritten email addresses. A handwritten email address, however, is not a bookmark for an email address. By contrast, an email address is the actual email address. In other words, nowhere does Clary suggest that users would enter a “bookmark” for the email address instead of the actual email address. Furthermore, claim 17 recite that the bookmark is a user recognizable mnemonic hint for the internet address. Nowhere does Clary suggest that users would enter bookmarks that are “mnemonic hints” for an internet address instead of the actual internet address.

As noted above with regard to claim 1, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to interpret the words in claim 17 in accordance with their plain meaning.



For at least these reasons, claim 17 is allowable over Clary in view of deHond.  
The dependent claims are allowable for at least these reasons.

As yet another example, claim 17 recites the following (emphasis added):

associated with the combination of internet access device,  
writing digitizer tablet and stylus, program code using said  
digitizer tablet for generating bookmarks thereon related to  
respective search resultant internet sites such that said sites are  
accessible directly via said bookmarks, wherein each of said  
bookmarks is a **handwritten** mnemonic hint that is user  
recognizable as a previously selected internet site address.

The Office Action appears to admit that Clary does not teach this recitation.  
Applicant agrees with this admission. The Office Action, however, attempts to cure this  
deficiency with column 2, lines 45-65 in deHond. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Column 2, lines 45-65 in deHond states that users can click on “hyperlinked terms  
or graphics on a web page” and be taken to the web page. Nowhere does deHond disclose  
or even suggest that these hyperlinks or graphics are “handwritten mnemonic hints.”

For at least these reasons, claim 17 is allowable over Clary in view of deHond.  
The dependent claims are allowable for at least these reasons.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, Applicant believes all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

**Hewlett-Packard Company**  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren  
Reg. No. 40,709  
Ph: 832-236-5529